



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 1:13-cr-145
)	
HANI WAHBI,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

CRIMINAL INFORMATION

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY CHARGES THAT:

Between July 15, 2010 and November 23, 2010, in and around Herndon, Virginia, within the Eastern District of Virginia, the Defendant, Hani Wahbi, willfully and knowingly made and caused to be made a materially false, fictitious, and fraudulent statement and representation in a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Commerce, a department or agency of the United States, as described below:

1. On or about July 15, 2010, the Defendant was interviewed by Special Agents Jack Glover and Joseph Varga from the Bureau of Industry and Security ("BIS") at the Department of Commerce concerning export transactions he was involved in. During the interview, the Defendant stated that several web-sensors, which were the subject of the BIS investigation, were ultimately destined for Dubai.
2. On or about October 14, 2010, the Defendant was interviewed a second time by Special Agents Jack Glover and Joseph Varga concerning the export of the web-sensors. The Defendant was advised that making false or misleading statements to federal officers was a

crime. Once again, the Defendant stated that the web-sensors were ultimately destined for Dubai, not Sudan.

3. On or about November 23, 2010, the Defendant was interviewed a third time by Special Agents Jack Glover and Joseph Varga concerning the export of the web-sensors. The Defendant was again advised that making false or misleading statements to federal officers was a crime. Once again, the Defendant stated that the web-sensors were ultimately destined for Dubai, not Sudan. Special Agent Glover reminded the Defendant that making false statements to a federal officer was a criminal offense, after which the Defendant admitted that the web-sensors were ultimately destined for Sudan.

4. These statements and representations were false because, as the Defendant then and there knew, the web-sensors were ultimately destined for Sudan. Specifically, a contact in Sudan reached out to the Defendant for a quote on the web-sensors, and the Defendant knew his contact was based in Sudan. And the Defendant later admitted that the web-sensors were ultimately destined for Sudan. These statements were material in that, had they been believed, the Defendant's false statements were capable of influencing an ongoing export-control investigation.

(In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001).

Neil H. MacBride
United States Attorney

5/23/13

By:


Vikram Jagadish
Special Assistant United States Attorney (LT)